Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/517,868	DECROUPET ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gerard T. Higgins	4174
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>30</u>	
(1) <u>Gerard T. Higgins</u> .	(3)	,
(2) <u>Jerold Schneider</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 October 2007	Time: <u>11:45am</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1-6, 9-12, 19-22, 24-29, 33, and 35-40		
Prior art documents discussed: EP 0304234 and EP 0233003		· v
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner requested an oral election for a lack of unity restriction requirement. Mr. Schneider declined the oral election and requested that the restriction requirement be sent in writing.		
Part III.		
 □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
Pond need		
Duy A Mugas II		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Representative Si	ignature – if appropriate)